

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 6 August 6, 2019 251 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Meletrich v. Commissioner of Correction, 332 C 615	27
<i>Habeas corpus; certification from Appellate Court; whether petitioner's trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to call second alibi witness; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that habeas court's denial of petition for certification to appeal did not constitute abuse of discretion.</i>	
Nietupski v. Del Castillo (Order), 332 C 913	71
Reclaimant Corp. v. Deutsch, 332 C 590	2
<i>Conflict of laws; unjust enrichment; statutes of limitations (§§ 52-576 and 52-577); motion for summary judgment on ground that plaintiff failed to timely commence action; claim that plaintiff failed to commence action within three year limitation period set forth in § 17-607 (c) of Delaware Revised Uniform Limited Partnership Act; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that Delaware law rather than Connecticut law governed issue of whether plaintiff's unjust enrichment claims were time barred; whether statute of limitations for unjust enrichment claims property is characterized as substantive or procedural for choice of law purposes; claim, as alternative ground for affirming trial court's judgment, that plaintiff's unjust enrichment claims were barred by three year limitation period in § 52-577 generally applicable to tort actions or under doctrine of laches.</i>	
State v. Dudley, 332 C 639	51
<i>Petition, pursuant to statute (§ 54-142d), to erase records relating to finding that defendant had violated terms of his probation; whether trial court improperly denied defendant's petition; claim that defendant was entitled to erasure of records because they purportedly pertained to conviction of offense that subsequently was decriminalized by legislature.</i>	
Volume 332 Cumulative Table of Cases	73

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Dudley v. Commissioner of Transportation, 191 CA 628	44A
<i>Sovereign immunity; state highway defect statute (§ 13a-144); motion to dismiss; claim that notice was patently defective because it failed to provide defendant with sufficient notice of location of allegedly defective manhole cover; whether trial court properly denied motion to dismiss; whether written notice of claim provided sufficient information regarding location of allegedly defective manhole cover and was not patently defective; claim that statutory waiver of sovereign immunity did not apply because state did not have duty to maintain sidewalk area in question and that its responsibility to maintain sidewalks extended only to limited sidewalks on which statute conferred such duty; whether allegedly defective manhole cover was within definition of highway defect, pursuant to § 13a-144; whether waiver of sovereign immunity applied because manhole in question was located between state owned road and stone wall; claim that doctrine of sovereign immunity barred plaintiff's claims because plaintiff was pedestrian traveling by foot and had not ventured incidentally onto sidewalk; whether plaintiff's travel was for purpose connected with travel over state highway within meaning of § 13a-144; whether state may be held liable for injuries occurring in area adjacent to state highway; whether finder of fact reasonably could have concluded that plaintiff's travel was incidental to and for purposes of travel on highway.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Jackson v. Drury, 191 CA 587 3A
Probate; trusts; motion to dismiss; whether trial court properly granted motion to dismiss appeal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on ground that appeal was untimely pursuant to statute (§ 45a-186 [a]); whether plaintiff lacked standing to appeal where she failed to allege colorable claim of direct personal injury; whether plaintiff was aggrieved by Probate Court's decree; failure of plaintiffs to file appeal within thirty days of when Probate Court's order was mailed; claim that doctrine of equitable estoppel tolled late filing of appeal.

Meriden v. Freedom of Information Commission, 191 CA 648 64A
Administrative appeal; alleged violation of Freedom of Information Act (§ 1-200 et seq.); whether gathering of less than quorum of city council was "proceeding" within meaning of § 1-200 (2), and constituted "meeting" within meaning of statute; whether plaintiff violated applicable statute (§ 1-225 [a]) by failing to properly notify leadership group gathering; claim that trial court erred in concluding that gathering of less than quorum of city council members to set agenda and decide to submit resolution for action by full city council constituted meeting under § 1-200 (2) and that such gathering constituted step in process of agency-member activity such that it was proceeding within meaning of § 1-200 (2); whether gathering of leadership group of less than quorum of city council members did not constitute meeting within meaning of § 1-200 (2) and did not trigger open meeting requirements of § 1-225 (a); whether gathering of leadership group served adjudicatory function within plain meaning of "hearing" or "proceeding"; whether, under holding of Windham v. Freedom of Information Commission (48 Conn. App. 529), gathering akin to "convening or assembly" as opposed to "hearing or other proceeding" of less than quorum of members of public agency constituted "meeting" within meaning of § 1-200 (2); whether trial court's interpretation of "hearing or other proceeding" in § 1-200 (2) as alluding to gathering between agency members that constituted step in process of agency-member activity was supported by language of statute or this court's interpretation of statute.

Moutinho v. 500 North Avenue, LLC, 191 CA 608 24A
Foreclosure; motion to dismiss; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to dismiss; reviewability of claim challenging trial court's denial of motion to dismiss; claim that court improperly failed to rule on oral motion for judgment of dismissal for failure to make out prima facie case under applicable rule of practice (§ 15-8) at close of plaintiff's case-in-chief; harmless error; claim that trial court improperly denied defendant right to make closing arguments or to file posttrial briefs in lieu of closing arguments under applicable rule of practice (§ 15-5 [a]).

Moutinho v. 1794 Barnum Avenue, Inc. (See Moutinho v. 500 North Avenue, LLC), 191 CA 608 24A

Moutinho v. Red Buff Rita, Inc. (See Moutinho v. 500 North Avenue, LLC), 191 CA 608 24A

State v. Carrasquillo, 191 CA 665 81A
Murder; criminal possession of firearm; unpreserved claim that defendant was deprived of rights to due process and to jury trial because trial court applied improper pressure on jury to reach verdict; claim that jury would have believed

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL
 (ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
 Office of Production and Distribution
 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
 Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
 www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*
 Published Weekly – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
 ERIC M. LEVINE, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions*
 Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

it would not be excused at end of day if it did not reach verdict after receiving Chip Smith instruction; claim that trial court did not respond to note from juror that alerted court to existence of family emergency that would require juror's absence beginning on certain date; claim that trial court sanctioned pressure that juror was under from other members of jury; claim that two hours of jury deliberation after trial court gave jury Chip Smith instruction suggested that court coerced jury to reach unanimous verdict; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for mistrial; claim that defendant was denied fair trial because trial court failed to conduct inquiry of juror at time of trial as to note from juror; waiver of claim that trial court failed to canvass juror at time it received note; unpreserved claim that defendant was denied right to due process because trial court's response to note from jury about accessorial liability as to murder charges created reasonable possibility that jury was misled about state's burden of proof; waiver of objection to jury instructions concerning accessorial liability; claim that jury instruction on accessorial liability as to murder charge constituted plain error; claim that jury instruction on accessorial liability as to murder charge created possibility of confusion in minds of jurors as to what evidence state relied on in support of murder counts or with respect to mental state required for commission of murder as accessory.

Volume 191 Cumulative Table of Cases 129A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Town of Suffield—Notice of Application for Affordable Housing Certificate of Completion 1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Disbarment of Attorney 1C
 Notice of Suspension of Attorney 1C

ASSIGNMENT OF JUDGES

September 2, 2019—September 6, 2020. 1D
